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SUMMARY

The world is not becoming a safer place. Violent conflict has emerged as a central obstacle to the attainment of equitable and sustainable development and reaching the Millennium Development Goals. According to the World Bank, some 1.5 billion people live in fragile and conflict affected contexts in some 90 countries. Many of these are caught in what could be referred to as a ‘violence trap’. New, dynamic developments, like the Arab Spring, increase instability. Increasingly, elections become violently contested. Experts foresee an increase in conflicts as a result of competition for scarce resources.

There are a lot of countries with potential for violent conflict but they lack adequate analysis, mechanisms and structures to deal with this. The usual government response is to reinforce law and order. Often, though, governments do not provide security and justice for all citizens. Many are fragile or highly polarized. Inter-ethnic tensions may be rising, societies become more divided on core issues; politics may become intertwined with gangs and criminality.

Outside intervention to address a violent conflict in a country has become more complicated. It may also be obsolete: instead of intervening in countries we could do better to assist them to build their own capacities in preventing and solving conflicts.

Peacebuilding requires multi-level and long-term investment targeted at building capacities and structures that can help prevent violent conflicts, manage those that erupt, ensure the implementation of peace agreements and address - over time - the structural roots of violent conflict. The I4P concept acknowledges the need for structural and long-term measures founded on capacities and ownership within the country and its communities.

A comprehensive definition of I4P is from UNDP: A network of interdependent systems, resources, values and skills held by government, civil society and community institutions that promote dialogue and consultation; prevent conflict and enable peaceful mediation when violence occurs in a society.

Some of the key-components are

- *Peace Committees*. It is very important to have a peace structure at all levels, national, district and local. These committees consist in general of highly respected persons who are capable of bridging political divides. They possess competence, knowledge and experience in matters of conflict transformation and peacebuilding. Their main objectives are violence reduction, promoting dialogue, problem solving, community building and reconciliation.
- **National Peacebuilding Platform or Forum**, consisting of the main stakeholders in peacebuilding, for consultation and cooperation.
- **Conflict Analysis and Early Warning & Response System.**
- **Building national capacities for peace**: the aim is to increase the capacity of peacebuilding institutions of government, departments, peace committees and others, including CSO groups.

In the past twenty years several countries have pioneered with such a peace infrastructure. When Nelson Mandela was released from prison, in February 1990, the country was deeply divided and violence was escalating. The main protagonists in the conflict – 27 parties and institutions – decided to sign a National Peace Accord in 1991. They included the government, most political parties, major liberation movements, business, churches and others. The established Peace structure consisted of:

- a National Peace Committee with representatives of all signatories
- Regional Peace Committees in all 11 regions of the country
- Local Peace Committees (LPCs) in all affected areas, in total some 260
- a National Peace Secretariat to establish and coordinate regional and local peace committees.

The main tasks of the Local Peace Committees were to create trust and reconciliation between community leaders, prevent violence and resolve disputes that could lead to public violence.

Kenya and Ghana have also developed an I4P in a very solid and inclusive process over a long period of time: 15 to 20 years. The existence of peace structures has reduced or prevented violence during elections in both countries. In districts where District Peace Committees had been established, less violence took place during the post-election violence in Kenya in 2007 than in districts without DPCs. Because of these successes, the government decided to establish DPCs in all 50 districts. Other countries have had similar experiences.

Government involvement in I4P is important. It can however limit the legitimacy of the I4P as well or become divisive, especially when government or the police are not trusted by civil society. In countries where governments are corrupt or fail to deliver security and justice, it might be better to start an I4P from the bottom and then seek government involvement, if appropriate, at the local level.

It is crucial to establish an institution with a clear mandate for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. A National Peace Council with as its main tasks mediating in political and social conflict and advocating social cohesion may be a preferred option. However, such a council has to maintain a profile of political impartiality.
Elections can be an entry-point for starting a national debate on the need for Infrastructures for Peace. Elections are a catalyst for democratic change. In many countries, a key challenge to the governance and political process is that electoral competitions are a zero-sum game: the winner takes all. Elections may also make deeply rooted social conflicts visible and provide the opportunity for people to express other grievances. However, in several conflict-ridden countries peaceful elections have recently occurred. In many of those successful cases, UN-backed initiatives to develop and apply national capacities for conflict prevention and transformation contributed to the peaceful elections.

Local Peace Committees fulfill important roles, filling a void in local communities, countering and mitigating fragility or insecurity. They can step in where a government is fragile and lacks legitimacy, or where security institutions are failing or do not exist. LPCs fulfill vital functions in fostering dialogue in divided communities, managing conflict and protecting communities from violence. They often have a working relationship with local government.

The interest in and acknowledgement of I4P is increasing. There clearly is an urge to have I4P established in more countries. The need to transform societies from fragility to resilience requires institutionalizing mechanisms and systems of capacity building, in order to deal with these challenges in an inclusive and peaceful manner.

This Background Paper includes profiles of countries that are pioneering with I4P, such as Ghana, Kenya, Nepal, Kyrgyzstan, The Philippines and Costa Rica. The Paper also highlights the existence of hundreds of Local Peace Committees in the DRC, Afghanistan and Colombia.
PREFACE

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP) is a worldwide community of individuals from civil society, business and government who are working toward a Culture of Peace by promoting the development of Infrastructures for Peace (I4P). GAMIP is holding its Sixth Summit from 16th to 21st September in Geneva.

The International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace was established in the spring of 2013. This network collects and exchanges experiences and best practices of local peacebuilders on Infrastructures for Peace and Local Peace Committees (LPCs). It also spreads knowledge of I4P and LPCs, nationally and internationally, facilitates dialogue on the potential of I4P and LPCs with different stakeholders and enhances the position of LPCs and NGOs within I4P.

These two global networks focusing on Infrastructures for Peace will organize a Seminar on Infrastructures for Peace with a National Mandate on September 19th, 2013.

The seminar will take advantage of Geneva’s unique character to gather an influential and varied group of actors, including government representatives, BCPR/UNDP and CSOs, to learn about and discuss a wide variety of Infrastructures for Peace with a national mandate. It will also provide an opportunity to representatives from Local Peace Committees from different countries to present their initiatives. The seminar will provide a wonderful opportunity for government officials who have been involved in creating and/or supporting Infrastructures for Peace to sit together, share experiences and discuss institutional approaches for the promotion of peace.

Aims
The seminar aims to:

- exchange experiences in different countries, focusing on achievements and challenges;
- give visibility to current Infrastructures for Peace, underlining their role in sustainable strategies of peace promotion;
- reach out to the diverse community of State Missions to the UN, CSOs, international organizations and the press in Geneva in order to increase the international community’s support for Infrastructures for Peace;
- gather governments of countries affected by violence, (potential) donor countries, as well as those involved in current or future initiatives in Infrastructures for Peace;
- serve as a bridge among governments and CSOs to further Infrastructures for Peace at the national and sub-national level.
This background paper consists of key information about Infrastructures for Peace and Local Peace Committees in several countries; these will be discussed at the seminar. Much of this information can also be found on the website of the International Civil Society Network on I4P [www.i4pinternational.org](http://www.i4pinternational.org) and in two recent articles on I4P.¹

Oliver Rizzi Carlson
Secretary, Board of Directors GAMIP

Paul van Tongeren
Founder, International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace

¹ - Creating Infrastructures for Peace-Experiences at Three Continents; by Paul van Tongeren; Pensamiento Propio 36-37, March 2013 [www.CRIES.org](http://www.CRIES.org)
I INFRASTRUCTURES FOR PEACE

1.1 Introduction

It is only recently that the subject of Infrastructures for Peace (I4P) received some attention in peacebuilding literature. In general, not much is known about the actual developments in this field. In this paper, we present context, facts and developments pertaining to several countries that are pioneering with an I4P-approach.

We hope this information will help participants to appreciate the speeches and discussion, and serve as an invitation to further study this interesting and promising approach in the field of peacebuilding.

The seminar of September 19th, 2013 on Infrastructures for Peace will be the first public event on this issue and feature high-level speakers from many countries, representing governments, civil society and the UN.

This paper has the following content:
1. Infrastructures for peace
   - Concept of Infrastructures for Peace
   - Components of an I4P
   - Rationale of an I4P
   - Does it work?
   - Role of the government and peaceful elections
2. Country profiles
   Short profiles of countries that are pioneering with I4P: Ghana, Kenya, Nepal, Kyrgyzstan, The Philippines and Costa Rica
3. Local Peace Committees
   Short profiles of LPCs in the DRC, Afghanistan, Colombia and the US
4. Conclusions
5. References
6. Information on the organizing networks
7. Bio’s of speakers
8. Seminar program
1.2 Concept of Infrastructures for Peace

The concept of I4P is relatively new. When peacebuilding efforts over the past decades demonstrated both the complexity and the limitations of achieving sustainable peace in conflict-affected societies, practitioners, policymakers and scholars looked for new approaches.

The concept was originally formulated in the 1980s by the practitioner and scholar John Paul Lederach. It was based on his experiences with local and national peace processes and the use of committees in peace negotiations. He saw I4P as part of a comprehensive approach to address protracted internal conflicts. The approach would have to embrace an understanding of the dynamic interplay and interdependence between the various levels of society, the need for a greater strategic engagement that links response to immediate and emerging crises, and the commitment to sustainability through locally rooted peacebuilding.

South Africa was among the first countries that experimented with such a peace infrastructure. When Nelson Mandela was released from prison, in February 1990, the country was deeply divided and violence was escalating. The main protagonists in the conflict – 27 parties and institutions – decided to sign a National Peace Accord in 1991. They included the government, most political parties, major liberation movements, business, churches and others. The established Peace structure consisted of

- a National Peace Committee with representatives of all signatories
- Regional Peace Committees in all 11 regions of the country
- Local Peace Committees (LPCs) in all affected areas, in total some 260
- a National Peace Secretariat to establish and coordinate regional and local peace committees.

The main tasks of the Local Peace Committees were to create trust and reconciliation between community leaders, prevent violence and resolve disputes that could lead to public violence.

Kenya and Ghana are also pioneering with I4P and have established several key elements of an I4P.

A comprehensive definition of I4P is from UNDP: *A network of interdependent systems, resources, values and skills held by government, civil society and community institutions that promote dialogue and consultation; prevent conflict and enable peaceful mediation when violence occurs in a society.*

Peacebuilding requires multi-level and long-term investments targeted at building capacities and structures that can help prevent violent conflicts, manage those that erupt, ensure the implementation of peace agreements and address - over time - the structural roots of violent conflict. The I4P concept acknowledges the need for structural and long-term measures founded
on capacities and ownership within the country and its communities.

Some remarks may further deepen our knowledge of the complexity of I4P and the different ways it may be implemented.

**Building I4P is a (long) process**

Following the release of Nelson Mandela in South Africa and given the need for a peaceful democratic transition, it was possible to set up a peace structure in a very short time. Often though it is a longer process of trial and error and it may take years before it is functioning. One may borrow an example from the health sector.

In any country, establishing a functioning Health Infrastructure may encompass:

- the training of health professionals – as doctors, nurses, scientists, pharmacists as well as psychologists, homeopaths – at university faculties or academies;
- the building of hospitals
- the building of pharmacies
- building civil society capacity – including health clinics, community-based health care initiatives, Red Cross & Red Crescent
- establishing government infrastructure and capacity – including a Ministry of Health;
- developing prevention policies (amongst others vaccination strategies) and Rapid Response Systems – including ambulances
- building a Global Inter-Governmental Infrastructure – including the World Health Organisation
- promoting a Culture of Health and healthy living
- developing a Code of Conduct, as the Hippocratic Oath.²

This is a process that takes decades or longer. In a similar vein, building an Infrastructure for Peace requires a long time-frame. Most countries, currently establishing (elements of) I4P, are in a pioneering phase.

**Top-down and bottom-up approach**

In Nepal, elements of an I4P were established in the capital and then rolled out with little consultation of other stakeholders, neither in the capital, nor at district or local level. This turned out to be an obstacle in the process. Experience so far shows that bottom-up approaches are preferable. Functioning I4Ps that have been set up in a district or a region can be transferred to other regions because they have been built on local customs and practice. In Kenya and Ghana,

---

there was a time-lag of between seven and ten years, from achieving local success with some District Peace (Advisory) Committees to the establishment of some national peace infrastructure. Consultation of the main stakeholders and sectors of society, at all levels, is crucial.

**Involvement of the government**

Involvement of the government in I4P is important. It can however limit the legitimacy of the I4P as well. It can also be divisive, when government or the police are not trusted by civil society. In countries where governments are corrupt or fail to deliver security and justice, it might be better to start an I4P from the bottom and then seek government involvement, if appropriate, at the local level. (See also paragraph 1.6 below)

**Key components and elements of an I4P**

As noted above, the UNDP defines an I4P as a network of interdependent systems, resources, values and skills held by government, civil society and community institutions. Such a network may encompass different elements of an I4P. What is important, however, is to distinguish a broad array of possible elements of an I4P from those components that are crucial for the functioning of an I4P.

In paragraph 1.3 below, we will mention key components of an I4P, as designed and implemented in some countries. This will serve to illustrate that building a well-functioning I4P takes time. A closely-knit, diverse network that is successful in preventing violence is capable of making an excellent contribution towards the chance of violence not recurring.

**No uniform model, but many manifestations**

Every I4P needs to be authentic and designed by the stakeholders themselves or in close collaboration with the main stakeholders. However, there are key elements to an I4P. In his article *Building National Infrastructures for Peace*, Chetan Kumar described the different activities this may entail, such as:

- organizing a national dialogue
- establishing a network of local mediators easing tensions among communities
- providing quiet support for national efforts to reach a political agreement on a draft constitution
- assisting with implementing an early warning and response system by governments and CSOs
- supporting advocacy campaigns for peace and establishing or strengthening Peace Committees at all levels.

3 *Building National “Infrastructures for Peace: UN Assistance for Internally Negotiated Solutions to Violent Conflict*; by Chetan Kumar, in: Peacemaking : from Practice to Theory, edit. By Susan Allen Nan, Zacharia
1.3 Components of an Infrastructure for Peace

The concept of Infrastructures for Peace is relatively new and descriptions are sometimes very broad, like the many types of activities mentioned by Chetan Kumar in his article. It is not easy to identify all the different components but policy documents from two pioneering countries, Ghana and Kenya, are helpful. Both have developed an I4P in a very solid and inclusive process over a long period of time: 15 to 20 years.

In 2011, Ghana institutionalized its Peace Architecture in the *National Peace Council Act*[^4]. In 2001, Kenya established a Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management and after many consultations produced a final version of a *National Policy on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management* (December 2011).[^5] From these two policy documents we can learn more about the main components, the pillars under the Infrastructures for Peace.

**Peace Committees**

It is very important to have a peace structure at all levels, national, district and local. These committees consist in general of highly respected persons who are capable of bridging political divides. They possess competence, knowledge and experience in matters of conflict transformation and peacebuilding (in some cases, it might be appropriate to have representatives from opposing parties within the peace committees). The work of the Peace Committees has to be guided by bipartisanship and independence. Their main objectives are violence reduction, promoting dialogue, problem solving, community building and reconciliation.

**A National Peacebuilding Platform or Forum**

Such a Platform or Forum consists of the main stakeholders in peacebuilding, for consultation and cooperation.

**A Conflict Analysis and Early Warning & Response System**

This system includes thorough conflict analysis, follow-up programs that deal with the different conflicts and the establishment of a warning and response system.

[^4]: *National Peace Council Act* (2011); see website [www.i4pinternational.org](http://www.i4pinternational.org)
A Peacebuilding Support Unit
This Unit may be established at national government level, often the Ministry of the Interior. The Unit will develop and implement government policy on peacebuilding, together with the National Peace Committee and Platform.

A Bill on Infrastructures for Peace
Such a bill should be the result of an intensive process of consulting the main stakeholders, at all levels.

Building National Capacities for Peace
The aim is to increase the capacity of peacebuilding institutions of government, departments, peace committees and others, including CSO groups. Broad based skills training will be offered to public servants or members of civil society, including conflict analysis, early warning and response, conflict resolution and supporting dialogue processes.

Involvement of Insider Mediators
The development and application of national and local capacities requires sustained accompaniment, where specialists assist their counterparts in overcoming initial suspicion and hostility by developing relations of trust and then impart skills for negotiation and mediation. Strengthening the role of insider mediators is essential. Peace and Development advisors from UNDP can play those roles as well.

Traditional Perspectives on Conflict Resolution
Traditional perspectives, understanding and solutions to conflict will be offered and strengthened.

Promotion of a Shared Vision of Society and a Culture of Peace
Common values and a shared vision of society will be promoted and policies and structures established to implement them. Values of reconciliation, tolerance, trust and confidence building, mediation and dialogue as responses to conflict will be highlighted.

Peace Education
Peace Education and the celebration of the International Day of Peace, September 21st, will be part of such an overall policy.
Peacebuilding and conflict management intervention strategies require long-term funding by governments, donors, NGOs and communities.

**Establishing, implementing and monitoring an Infrastructure for Peace**

In the initial phase of establishing an infrastructure, main stakeholders will be consulted: government and non-state actors and different sectors of society at the national, district and local level. Analyzing the root causes of conflict in a country should be a participatory and inclusive effort. When such a policy has been approved, it has to be operationalized and regular assessments have to be executed.

Most of these components of an I4P can be found in many documents or policy papers in different countries. Even though they are perceived as essential elements of an I4P, they are not a straitjacket but possible pillars of a national infrastructure for peace. It is essential that each process, structure and mechanism is authentic and designed by the stakeholders themselves or in close collaboration with the main stakeholders.

Sometimes, the modalities are slightly different. There may not be a Peace Committee involved, but a Mediation Platform; not a Unit, but a Government department.

### 1.4. Rationale of an Infrastructure for Peace

The world is not becoming a safer and more secure place. The opposite seems to happen. Violent conflict has emerged as a central obstacle to the attainment of equitable and sustainable development and reaching the Millennium Development Goals. According to the World Bank, some 1.5 billion people live in fragile and conflict affected contexts in some 90 countries. Many of these are caught in what could be referred to as a ‘violence trap’. New, dynamic developments, like the Arab Spring, increase instability.

There is also a growing trend that elections become more contested and violent, as recently happened in DRC, Nigeria, Ivory Coast and Kenya. Elections become triggers for dormant, unsolved conflicts. Because the root causes of injustice, lack of security and deep grievances are not addressed, those feelings and resentments flare up during elections. During the 1990s and

---


7 *The Changing Nature of Conflict: Priorities for UNDP Response*; February 2013
into this century, West Africa witnessed up to six civil conflicts. There have been developments towards more stability in at least four of these, but turbulence persists in Guinea Bissau and Nigeria, while Mali recently began to show new patterns of violent conflict.

There are a lot of countries with potential for violent conflict but they lack adequate analysis, mechanisms and structures to deal with this. The usual government response is to reinforce law and order. Often, though, governments do not provide security and justice for all citizens. Many are fragile or highly polarized. Inter-ethnic tensions may be rising, societies become more divided on core issues; politics may become intertwined with gangs and criminality.

Experts foresee an increase in conflicts as a result of competition for scarce resources. "As a result of the economic downturn, climate change and the growing depletion of resources, from arable land to water to oil, disputes within and between States may become more common in the future."\(^8\)

Outside intervention to address a violent conflict in a country has become more complicated. It may also be obsolete: instead of intervening in countries we could do better to assist them to build their own capacities in preventing and solving conflicts. As former SGUN Kofi Annan wrote in his 2006 Review report on Conflict Prevention: "Essentially, the aim should be the creation of a sustainable national infrastructure for peace."\(^9\)

During the last two decades it has been shown that this approach is fruitful. South Africa successfully pioneered a peace structure during the years preceding elections in 1994, building mechanisms at local, and regional levels that effectively stopped the escalation of violence. In Ghana and Kenya the existence of Peace Committees has reduced or prevented violence during elections. Additionally, investing in Peace Infrastructures is highly cost-effective.

### 1.5 Does it work?

This chapter describes in more detail how Peace Infrastructures have worked in practice and have prevented or reduced violence. Not all cases are thoroughly documented; more research is needed to assess how and when I4P works. Still, in the cases of Kenya and in Ghana, Regional Peace Committees worked so well that national governments spread the model. We highlight

---


the broad consultation processes of main stakeholders, key to the concept of I4P.

**Ghana**

In Ghana, 23 violent conflicts were recorded in three northern regions between 1980 and 2002. Many community-based and inter-ethnic conflicts were intractable, because of a failing justice system; court cases were not resolved. When violence first erupted, the government suppressed it by using force. It then appointed a Commission of Inquiry that allocated blame and recommended sanctions.

This approach led to more conflict. It is estimated that up to 5,000 people died as a result of the Konkomba-Nanumba conflict in 1994, which involved seven ethnic groups. After this eruption, NGOs initiated a different approach by integrating peacebuilding and development work. The thinking was that once communities owned the process of finding mutually acceptable solutions to problems that divided them, development programs could become sustainable. In summary, civil society sought to uncover the deeper sources of conflict and to focus on dialogue, deeper mutual understanding, joint problem-solving and reconciliation.

NGOs formed a working group called the Inter-NGO Consortium. They organized and facilitated a series of peace and reconciliation consultations and workshops among the warring ethnic groups. After negotiations, the delegates agreed to a draft document, which was taken by the delegates to their respective communities for extensive consultations. After four weeks, the delegates returned. Amendments were incorporated in the draft agreement and the Kumasi Accord on Peace and Reconciliation was signed March 1996.

When in 2002 an eruption of violence within the Dagombas led to the slaying of the King of Dagbon and many of his elders, the event threatened to destabilize the whole region. It became a major campaign issue during the elections. But then the regional government remembered the innovative approach to solving the Konkomba-Nanumba conflict. In 2004 it established the Northern Region Peace Advisory Council as a mediation and conflict resolution mechanism to deal with the issues of trust among the factions. With the success of the Northern region Peace Advisory Council, the government decided to explore the possibility and relevance of extending the peace council concept to the rest of the country.¹⁰

The national government sought technical assistance from the United Nations to assist it in designing and implementing a range of activities to build confidence among the factions, create

---

¹⁰ *Ghana: Developing an institutional framework for sustainable peace - UN, government and civil society collaboration for conflict prevention*; (2007), by Emmanuel Bombande; GPPAC Issue Paper on Joint Action for Prevention, p.46-54
spaces for dialogue between the traditional, business and other elite and build capacity within the leadership of the factions on negotiation and consensus formation. After a process of consultations, a Roadmap to Peace was signed by the chiefs in Kumasi in March 2006. The outcome of those consultations was a National Architecture for Peace. The key body of this infrastructure was the National Peace Council.

In December 2008, chieftancy-related conflicts in parts of the country and the discovery of oil led to new tensions as national elections were approaching and the prospects for violence increased. When the elections were held, the narrowest of margins – 50,000 votes – separated the winner from the loser. With tension rising, the National Peace Council helped mediate a peaceful political transition. Emmanuel Bombande from Ghana, founder of the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), concluded: "When it mattered most in an extremely difficult moment during Ghana’s elections in 2008, the National Peace Council was there to save Ghana."

Kenya

During the early 1990s a highly destructive cycle of violent conflict raged in the district of Wajir in the North-East region between different clans of Kenyan Somalis, leading to more than 1,200 deaths over a period of four years. The conflict had its roots in the centuries old custom of livestock raiding by pastoralist groups. The situation became more violent because of an influx of refugees from neighboring Somalia and Ethiopia, increasing aridity, the ready availability of small arms and the very weak presence of government in the district, resulting in the failure of state institutions to regulate conflict and provide security.

In 1993 a group of women met at the market place and started a discussion on ways to stop the violence. One of the women was Dekha Ibrahim Abdi, later to be honored as Kenyan Peacebuilder of the Year (2005). The discussions at the market place resulted in a process of peacemaking that is impressive by all accounts. The process entailed the formation of a group of civil society actors working together to sensitize the population to the need for peace. They engaged the elders of the different clans and set up a mediation process. After several meetings, the elders agreed to sign a code of conduct, which effectively stopped the violence. In this process civil society actors worked with representatives of formal authority, particularly the District Commissioner and Member of Parliament, but on a voluntary basis.

The initiative was homegrown and locally owned. It was soon realized, however, that the LPC would need some form of formalization to provide coordination to all peacebuilding activities. It

11 Chetan Kumar (see Note 3), p.389
was decided to integrate the peace initiatives into one structure that would bring government, NGOs and citizen groups together. This was done in May 1995, when the Wajir Peace and Development Committee was formed, with the District Commissioner as chairperson. Members included the heads of all government departments, representatives of the various peace groups, religious leaders, NGO representatives, traditional chiefs and security officers.

In Kenya, the success of the Wajir Peace and Development Committee led to the spread of this concept to other districts in the northeastern part of Kenya. In 2001, the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management was established.

The elections of December 2007 in Kenya were peaceful, but resulted in post-election violence that left some 1,500 people dead and 300,000 displaced. In districts where District Peace Committees had been established, less violence took place than in districts without DPCs. Because of these successes, the government decided to establish DPCs in all 50 districts. In 2010, a constitutional referendum was held, without any substantial violence. Ahead of the referendum, UNDP provided discrete support for successful national efforts to reach a political agreement on the new draft constitution. It also helped government and civil society implement an early warning and response system (the Uwiano Platform) that prevented more than one hundred incidents of potential violence in the volatile Rift valley alone. Local peace committees were strengthened in all of the country’s districts and played a critical role during the referendum.  

**South Africa**

Some information about the South African peace infrastructure has already been given (see paragraph 1.2). Several studies (especially Ball and Spies, 1998) have assessed the impact of LPCs on the elections. Some observations are:
- the 1994 elections were relatively peaceful;
- the LPCs contributed towards containing the spiral of violence, despite the fact that the number of violent deaths increased during the lifetime of the LPCs;
- LPCs facilitated local dialogue and (for the first time) assemblies of stakeholders made up of all relevant categories of participants were able to address local issues jointly.

13 *Citizens in Action: Making Peace in the Post-Election Crisis in Kenya; (2008)* by George Wachira; published by NPI-Africa, Citizens for Peace & GPPAC.

1.6 Role of Government

As described earlier, Infrastructures for Peace is a broad concept that can take many forms, ranging from I4P with a national mandate to informal Local Peace Committees that operate independently from the government. In Kenya and Ghana bottom-up processes developed in remote, poor regions; pioneering Regional Peace Committees were created and succeeded in attracting the interest of their governments. Examples of I4P with government leadership can be found in Philippines, Costa Rica, Peru and Nepal.

When Peace structures are designed, one option is to establish them within the government as was done in the examples above. Advantages may be derived from the weight of a government ministry, department or Peace Secretariat; there may also be good coordination with other ministries, especially on issues of security and justice. Disadvantages may include government dominance, with other stakeholders like civil society taking second place. Also, a more bureaucratic approach is a real danger. If there is a lot of polarization between or within government and political parties, a Ministry or Peace Secretariat may be partisan and less able to fulfill a bridge-building function. The amount of expertise and capacity recruited from outside (e.g. the community of peacebuilders) may be outweighed by that recruited from within the government. Experience has learned also that governments tend to steer the process in a top-down manner. And when a government is weak or corrupt, the peace structure it steers is doomed to fail.

The Nepal case clearly demonstrates the risks when political parties or the government want to steer the Peace Infrastructure without (much) consultation. This may kill the legitimacy of the Peace structure and paralyze it.

The other option is a (semi-) independent Peace Infrastructure, as was the case in Ghana and Kenya. Article 30 of the National Peace Council Act of Ghana (2011) states: "Independence of the Council: Except as provided in the Constitution, the Council shall not be subject to the direction or control of any person or authority in the performance of its functions."

Such a policy will be informed by one of the guiding principles of I4P, which is that the main stakeholders must be involved. The government will always play a crucial role in deciding on the mandate it will give to the Peace Infrastructure, in drafting a Policy Paper or a Bill, in deciding on the composition of the Peace Council, etc. By organizing consultations with civil society, by asking for nominations for Peace Committee-members and/or by giving respected civil society leaders a prominent role in a National Peace Committee, governments can aim for
equal positions of different stakeholders. In Ghana, the National Peace Council consists of thirteen Eminent Persons: eight representatives of religious bodies, other persons nominated by the president, identifiable groups and one representative of the National House of Chiefs.

With an independent peace infrastructure, expertise in peacebuilding, mediation and other capacities can be used more fully. With a government institution, there is a greater possibility for political appointments; civil servants may come from within the government bureaucracy rather than from outside, selected on their peacebuilding capacities. In many countries, politics and government have less legitimacy as compared to respected civil society leaders. Where the need for peace infrastructures and the potential for violent conflict are greater, the effectiveness of governments may sometimes be open to question, as a result of their weakness, their corruption or failure to deliver security and justice.

An independent Peace structure may be more flexible and less expensive. The NPC in Ghana has its own Secretariat, while the Ministry of the Interior – which is in charge of peacebuilding and security – has a small Peacebuilding Support Unit. The challenge is to find the right balance between independence and a government-steered body. Peacebuilding is an inclusive effort and involves the main stakeholders as equal partners. Too much independence and the government feels too distant with the added risk of having no weight or legitimacy; too little independence and the role of the various stakeholders (apart from the government) risks being diminished.

Why would a government give a mandate to a semi-independent Peace Infrastructure? It could be because not addressing the roots of violent conflict may cause dormant tensions to flare up and escalate, for instance during elections. This can ruin the whole social fabric and also undermine the positions of the ruling elite. Working with stakeholders, for the sake of sustainable peace, may facilitate a climate of stability and may give the ruling government more legitimacy, increase donor funding and foreign investments.

The type of Peace Infrastructure established in Ghana and Kenya is focused on soft power, on bridge building, confidence building, and mediation. Dealing with security and other power issues is still in the hands of the government. Governments that do not consider the wisdom of organizing an inclusive and participatory peace structure may do so at their peril. After all, recent years have not been free from electoral violence.

---

15 The political legitimacy of National Peace Committees; (2013); by Andries Odendaal; in Journal of Peacebuilding and Development, V7N3
1.7 Peaceful elections and Infrastructures for Peace

Elections can be an entry-point for starting a national debate on the need for Infrastructures for Peace.16 "Elections are a major catalyst for democratic change but have an intrinsically conflictual nature. Elections make deeply rooted social conflicts more visible and thus have great potential for triggering violence. If such violence is ignited by the electoral process, or perceived to have been, the effects may have grave implications for human rights and local economies, and may create an inherent distrust in the credibility of democracy."17

Elections are structured processes of competition for control of political power. In many countries, a key challenge to the governance and political process is that electoral competitions are a zero-sum game: the winner takes all. Election to public office offers livelihoods and privileges. Because of the consequences of electoral defeat the incentives to resort to electoral fraud and violence are high. Elections may also make deeply rooted social conflicts visible and provide the opportunity for people to express other grievances.

Following violent elections in Kenya in 2007 and in Côte d’Ivoire in 2010, the international community, national governments and civil society actors are becoming increasingly aware of the need to place a greater emphasis on prevention of electoral violence. The support has so far mainly focused on strengthening Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs), voter registration and electoral monitoring, but this is changing.

IDEA, the International Institute for Democratic and Electoral Assistance, distinguishes eight phases of the electoral cycle:18

- the legal and institutional electoral framework
- planning and preparation for the implementation of electoral activities
- training and education
- registration of voters, political parties and election observers
- electoral campaigning
- voting operations
- election results announcement
- post-electoral phase.


17 *Towards a Global Framework for Managing and Mitigating Election related Conflict and Violence*; (2009), Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, IDEA, p. 8

Within each section, three different clusters of prevention and mitigation actions are explored:

- *Improved electoral management and justice* - Specific measures, which relate to electoral planning, implementation, coordination and dispute resolution that can be undertaken to avoid controversies and technical flaws in order to minimize the potential for outbreaks of violence;
- *Improved electoral security* - Specific electoral security measures that can be undertaken by security sector agencies throughout the electoral cycle to protect electoral actors, events, facilities and materials from violence;
- *Improved infrastructures for peace* - Different activities that can be implemented by various state and non-state actors to mobilize and coordinate government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), traditional and religious leaders, reputable individuals and other organizations and individuals with capacity to contribute in defusing and mitigating election-related tensions and violence.

This three-layered approach can be consistently applied throughout the different phases of the electoral cycle in such a way that actors from the three layers will cooperate closely to reinforce each other. IDEA presents these ideas in the (draft) *Guide on Action Points for the Prevention and Mitigation of Election-related Violence*. This Guide has excellent case-descriptions relating to the different Action Points. The draft is circulating for comments and will be published this autumn.

Improved infrastructure for peace relates to putting in place standing capabilities for peacebuilding and conflict prevention from the community to the national level. These strategies may include mobilization and coordination of state and non-state actors, including civil society organizations (CSOs), traditional and religious leaders, reputable individuals that have the capacity to contribute in preventing and defusing social conflicts.\(^\text{19}\)

The effect of the efforts of formal institutions as EMBs to prevent and mitigate election-related violence may be maximized if they are combined with existing peacebuilding and conflict prevention initiatives. These may include national mediation panels, peace councils and other institutions and initiatives.

In addition to EMBs and the security sector, which have clear mandates and responsibilities to ensure that elections are peaceful, a number of other state and non-state actors may have a specific interest in contributing to peaceful elections. These may include CSOs and other groups and individuals, which represent the building blocks of a national infrastructure for peace. During the election planning phase, these actors should be proactive in identifying and reaching out to other organizations and individuals with a similar agenda and recognized potential to mediate and resolve disputes. This may require the establishment of a joint collaborative forum.

\(^{19}\) Guide, p. 18
I4P can provide a framework for the involvement of different stakeholders.

These are some of the highlights from the draft Guide, with a focus on ‘Improved infrastructure for peace.’20 Chetan Kumar (UNDP) links peaceful outcomes of elections in several countries to the UN-backed initiatives to develop and apply national capacities for conflict prevention and transformation. He mentions the peaceful elections in Guyana in 2006, Ghana in 2004 and 2008, Sierra Leone in 2007, and Togo, Kyrgyzstan and Solomon Islands in 2010 and the successful constitutional referendum in Kenya in 2010.21 In all these cases, crucial elements to get these results were:

- the presence of national platforms or mechanisms that enabled a minimum political consensus to be reached prior to elections;
- the presence of significant conflict management and mediation capabilities at district and local levels; and
- the work and involvement of civil society.

**Case: The Uwiano Platform for Peace in Kenya**

The Uwiano Platform for Peace was launched several months ahead of the 2010 constitutional referendum in Kenya. The referendum was the first voting exercise since the 2007 general election, when post-election violence caused the deaths of more than 1,500 people and the displacement of more than 300,000.

The strategic aim of Uwiano was to promote peacebuilding, conflict management and national cohesion and integration processes by developing a platform in which state and non-state organizations could work together at the national and sub-national levels. This was done through the identification of hot spots and the taking of timely action before, during and after election day. On the grass-roots level, District Peace Committees (DPCs), peace monitors and CSOs were tasked with communicating with the Joint Secretariat in Nairobi on issues of peace and conflict on a regular basis. This included SMS messages and early warning reports throughout the election period. Furthermore, DPCs were tasked with building partnerships with businesses and professionals at the local level as well as identifying rapid response teams and mediators to engage in confidence-building measures. In order to deploy for “local level negotiation and mediation processes, dialogue, communal cohesion activities, activities that counter propaganda and hate speech” the DPCs were expected to request funds from the Emergency

---


21 Chetan Kumar, see note 3, p. 395
Response Fund (ERF) administrated by the Joint Secretariat. In general, between 600 and 1,200 USD was disbursed per request within 48 hours. ERF received over fifty applications for community visit projects, public meetings, community dialogues, mediation and reconciliation.22 The Uwiano Platform for Peace was established by the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC); National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC); PeaceNet Kenya and UNDP.

22 This case is taken from the IDEA Guide, p. 90/91. See as well UWIANO Strategic Leadership and Peace Agenda for 2012 and Beyond.
II COUNTRY PROFILES

2.1 Ghana

Twenty-three conflicts were recorded in the three northern regions of the country between 1980 and 2002. Many community-based and inter-ethnic conflicts were intractable, because of a failing justice system and many court cases were not resolved. When violence erupted, official Commissions of Inquiry were established. However their recommendations were not implemented leading to unresolved conflicts.

This approach led to more violence. It is estimated that up to 5,000 people died as a result of the Konkomba-Nanumba conflict in 1994. The conflict involved seven ethnic groups. After this eruption, NGOs initiated a different approach, seeking deeper sources of conflict, focusing on dialogue and joint-problem solving. NGOs formed a working group called the Inter-NGO Consortium. In March 1996 the Kumasi Accord on Peace and Reconciliation was signed.

After the slaying of the King of Dagbon and many of his elders in 2002, the regional government established the Northern Region Peace Advocacy Council (NRPAC) as a mediation and conflict resolution mechanism to deal with the issues of trust among the factions, as restoring confidence and relationships was crucial.

With the success of the NRPAC, the government decided to explore the possibility of extending the peace council concept to the rest of the country. A range of consultations were organized with many different stakeholders at local, regional and national level. The outcome of these consultations was the development of the ‘National Architecture for Peace’, which consists of representatives of relevant stakeholders as well as individual Ghanaians who enjoy high levels of trust and respect in society. Councils are served by a body of professional Peace Promotion Officers connected to the ten Regional Peace Advisory Councils.

The National Architecture for Peace in Ghana was issued by the Ministry of Interior in May 2006. The National Peace Council (NPC) played a major role in ensuring peaceful elections in 2008 and a smooth transfer of power through discreet meetings with stakeholders that defused considerable tension. In November 2010, the National Peace Council Bill was presented to Parliament and in March 2011 it was unanimously adopted.

The functions of the NPC are to:

- harmonize and coordinate conflict prevention, management, resolution and build sustainable peace through networking and coordination;
strengthen capacities in relation to its objectives;
facilitate the amicable resolution of conflicts through mediation and other connected processes;
monitor, report and offer indigenous perspectives and solutions to conflicts in the country; and
promote understanding about the values of reconciliation, tolerance, confidence building, mediation and dialogue as responses to conflict.

The NPC is independent. It has a Board, consisting of thirteen eminent persons appointed by the President in consultation with the Council of State; eight members are representatives from religious bodies. The NPC also has Regional and District Peace Councils that consist of thirteen persons that have to engage in activities that include, among others, in public education, sensitization and awareness of conflict indicators within the region. Executive Secretaries will operate in each region and district. They are the secretaries of the Peace Councils with experience in conflict resolution and peace building.

Peace education was given to some 100 youth from all the regions in the country to become Peace Advocates within their communities. Capacity building programs were established with the three main political parties to strengthen their capacities to manage diversity and conflicting interests.


**Challenges** Regional Peace Advisory Councils (RPAC) were established in most regions, but not all. In some regions they merged with regional security structures. Some District Peace Advisory Councils have been established and Peace Promotion Officers have been appointed in most regions.

**NGOs/Civil society engagement** The NPC and RPCs were trained by the NGO WANEP, the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding.
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2.2 Kenya

Kenya is beset by a multitude of local conflicts that have the potential to escalate at any moment, as a result of resource crises, land tenure issues and political machinations. It is also the scene of some fascinating examples of bottom-up processes to establish a peace architecture. One of these started in 1993 with an initiative by a group of women of the Wajir district of Kenya, bordering Somalia and Ethiopia. There was a highly destructive cycle of violent conflict in that region, combined with a very weak governance presence, resulting in the failure of state institutions to regulate conflict, provide security and promote development.23

The success of the Wajir Peace and Development Committee in bringing peace to the district and in maintaining that peace, soon led to the spread of the model to other districts in the northern part of the country. In 2001, the government established a National Steering Committee (NSC) on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management. The Office of the President, through the NSC, embarked on a process towards the development of a national policy on peacebuilding and conflict management in 2004. The National Policy on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management, including the lessons learned from the Post-Election Violence of 2008, was published at the end of 20011 by the Office of the President.

During the post-Election Violence (end 2007/beginning 2008) communities with functional district peace committees succeeded in quickly controlling the violence, or contributed to preventing the escalation of violence – especially in the northern part of Kenya. After the establishment of the National Accord and Reconciliation Act 2008 the government decided to create District Peace Committees in all of Kenya’s districts. There is a fair amount of consensus among researchers and observers that the peace committees have, on the whole, been successful, especially in the pastoralist areas. They have demonstrated their ability to manage inter-community conflict and to contain or prevent violence. Progress has been made by the Adoption of the Constitution (Fall 2010); in the work of the National Commission on Cohesion and Integration and in tackling corruption. The Ministry of Education has introduced Peace Education to the schools.

Kenya, Africa’s second largest non-oil economy, held a constitutional referendum without a single incident of violence. Prior to the referendum, UNDP substantially supported national efforts to reach a political agreement on the new draft constitution, and helped government and civil society implement an early warning and response system – the Uwiano Platform – that prevented over a hundred incidents of potential violence in the volatile Rift Valley region alone.

23 See as well paragraph 1.5. Does it Work? on Kenya
Local peace committees were strengthened in all of the country’s districts, and played a critical peacemaking role during the referendum. Following the vote, UNDP is now assisting inter-party dialogue on the implementation of the new constitution.

**NGOs/Civil society engagement** The initiative in Wajir district consisted of civil society actors working together to sensitize the population to the need for peace. They engaged the Elders of different clans and set up a mediation process between them. In this process, civil society actors worked with and involved representatives of formal authority, particularly the District Commissioner and a Member of Parliament.

After some time, it became clear that some form of formalization was needed, so the peace initiatives were integrated into one structure. This structure is known as the District Development Committee, established within the district administration in Kenya, which brought government, NGOs and citizen groups together. In 1995 the Wajir Peace and Development Committee was formed, with the District Commissioner as chairperson. Members included the heads of all government departments, representatives of the various peace groups, religious leaders, NGO representatives, chiefs and security officers.

Both in the early years of the NSC, and after the recent post-election violence, broad consultations took place (amongst others in twelve regional Stakeholders Validation workshops) between the government and non-state actors, involving all relevant ministries, academia, development partners, regional organizations, CSOs, women, youth groups, communities, private sector and local authorities.
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2.3 Nepal

The root causes of the conflict in Nepal included feudalism, the exclusion of minorities, weak governance and government neglect, with the result that most districts and villages experienced tensions. It was partly a rural revolt against perceived discrimination and neglect. Peace at the local level had to be secured, or it would undermine the entire peace process.

In March 2007, the government of Nepal decided to create a Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction [www.peace.gov.np/index-en.html](http://www.peace.gov.np/index-en.html), becoming the second nation in the world to have such a ministry.

The decision to establish Local Peace Councils (LPCs) was taken as early as 2005, but the implementation was difficult and became contested. Some questioned the independence of the LPCs when they became closely linked with and reliant upon the later established Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction. There was reluctance to establish joint multi-party control over the peace architecture. Approximately sixty LPCs have been formed, but their functioning is an issue.

**NGOs/Civil society engagement** In the midst of Nepal’s decade-long conflict between the government and the Maoist rebels, civil society played a crucial role in mediating between the needs of special interests and those of the common good, due to the decade-old conflict, alienated from the mainstream democratic and development process. Various organized civil society groups in Nepal were formed and active during the conflict to put pressure on both sides to find a solution to the conflict.

Realizing that it would be not be possible to put adequate pressure on the government by working individually, several broader alliances were established to help the peace process. Examples are the eleven member Talks facilitation Committee, the Nepal Peace Initiative Alliance (NPIA), the Civic Forum, Civic Peace Commission and several others.

**Potential for enhancing Infrastructures for Peace** It has widely been perceived that the Comprehensive Peace Accord, concluded between the Government of Nepal and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoists) on November 21, 2006, and subsequent political developments have brought a decade-long armed conflict to a formal end and opened new avenues for the establishment of sustainable peace and socio-political transformation of the nation. Peace agreements signed by political leaders are often inadequate. Without a major effort for reconciliation at the grass roots, the destructive causes of conflict cannot be addressed or transformed into sustainable, ‘positive’ peace. In order to avoid the unfavorable situations and to mitigate the adverse impacts on social, economic and political life of the nation caused by the
violent conflict, it is vitally necessary to timely address its root causes and take appropriate measures for its resolution.
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2.4 Kyrgyzstan

Kyrgyzstan has seen a large amount of activity in conflict prevention by civil society organizations, supported by UNDP, OSCE and SDC in particular, since serious ethnic clashes erupted in the Ferghana Valley conflict in 1990. In the border regions of the Ferghana Valley, several actors have been engaged in cross-border cooperation support since the 1990s, including support for local people to establish structures to enable such cooperation. In addition, a number of organizations have established councils and committees at various levels to implement conflict prevention-related activities. The violence in 2010 between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in the south has led to a renewed focus on conflict prevention, and furthermore added peacebuilding to the agenda. More than 400 people have been killed; many of them Uzbeks, and thousands of people were displaced.

The first parliamentary democracy in Central Asia faces serious problems in terms of unemployment and criminality. The security forces have been unable to provide security, the justice sector is facing serious corruption problems, and the governments since independence have been unable to develop a comprehensive policy to address the multi-ethnic make-up of the population. Previously, the government established Crime Prevention Centers at the community level. In theory, these are headed by the first deputy head of a local municipality, and include representatives of traditional elders’ councils, women’s and youth groups, but most of these centers remain moribund in practice.

A Department for Ethnic Development and Religious Policy is working on a comprehensive concept on ethnic development. Furthermore, a State Directorate for Reconstruction and Development was established to oversee reconstruction efforts in the south.

Potentially violent tensions after the April 2010 political regime change and subsequent violence were de-escalated before and during the constitutional referendum and parliamentary polls later that year, allowing these exercises to be conducted without violence. For example, the UNDP
Peace and Development Program facilitated dialogue spaces between civil society, the Central Electoral Commission and security agencies, hitherto suspicious of each other following events of April-June. The UNDP also helped establish, and then supported the confidence-building efforts of, Oblast Advisory Committees (OACs) in the seven oblasts: at the provincial, and Local Authority Advisory Committees (LAACs) at the district levels, bringing together government and civil society representatives. For example, the OAC of Issyk-Gul facilitated dialogue between law enforcement agencies and youth and conducted awareness raising campaigns on the risks of religious extremism. These Oblast Advisory Committees were as critical as regional and UN diplomacy to maintaining peace on the ground during the referendum and parliamentary elections.

A number of similar mechanisms have been established at the rayon level as well. The UN agencies in Kyrgyzstan are aiming to support a national Infrastructure for Peace at local, regional and national levels, involving government, civil society, communities and individuals in effectively preventing violent conflict and engagement in peace building.

The Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI) is a key partner of UNDP and very interested in establishing such a peace structure.
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2.5 Philippines

In 1986, the People Power Revolution in the Philippines led to the fall of the Marcos dictatorship. Subsequently, peace talks with all rebel forces were initiated, the peace process as a government policy was formalized and the Office of the Peace Commissioner was established under the Office of the President.

Under President Ramos, the post of Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (PAPP) with Cabinet rank was created and charged with the management of the comprehensive peace process and assisted by a fulltime Secretariat (OPAPP, www.opapp.gov.ph). In 1993, three underlying principles of the peace process were adopted:
a comprehensive peace process should be community-based, reflecting the sentiments, values and principles important to all Filipinos;
a comprehensive peace process aims to forge a new social compact for a just, equitable, humane and pluralistic society;
a comprehensive peace process seeks a principal and peaceful resolution of the internal conflicts, with neither blame nor surrender, but with dignity for all concerned.

OPAPP is only a national body; there is no regional peace structure.

The government established Government Peace Negotiating Panels for negotiations with the different rebel groups. One Panel is focusing on the National Democratic Front (communist-led), one on the Moro National Liberation Front and the implementation of the so-called Final Peace Agreement (FPA) in 1996. In August 2010, under the new administration, OPAPP convened a consultation of civil society, August 2010, who decided to loosely band together to share and develop strategies in engaging the peace process. The body is tentatively called Kilos Kapayapaan, or Action for Peace. It will serve as a de facto consultative cum advisory body to OPAPP but will remain independent of it.

In 2001 the government decided on a Policy Framework for Peace – affirming the Guiding Principles and The Six Paths to Peace of the previous Administration – and formulated a National Peace Plan, with two components: Peacemaking and Peacekeeping (seeking to end all insurgency-related armed conflicts through peace negotiations and to reduce the level of violence through local and civil society-led peace initiatives) and Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention (seeking to address the major causes of insurgency, eliminate sources of grievance, rehabilitate and develop conflict-affected areas and heal the wounds created by the long years of armed conflict.

2.6 Costa Rica

Costa Rica was the third country in the world to abolish the death penalty in 1877. In 1948, Costa Rica became the first country to formally abolish its armed forces; the Constitution still forbids a standing military. In 1980 President Rodrigo Carazo facilitated the donation of Costa Rican land to establish the United Nations University for Peace [www.upeace.org], approved by the General Assembly of the UN.

President Carazo also proposed, together with the UK, a UN resolution for an International Day of Peace to be celebrated as a global ceasefire on the opening day of the UN session each year. This resolution was passed in 1981. In 2001, Costa Rica and the UK proposed a new resolution,
resetting the date to September 21st each year. The International Day of Peace is now celebrated around the world.

In the mid 1980’s, intense conflict and civil war marked Central America. Under the leadership of President Oscar Arias, the Esquipulas II Peace Agreement was signed in 1987. Arias won the Nobel Peace Prize for this achievement.

In 1997, a law for the Alternative Resolution of Conflicts and Promotion of Peace was passed. This law requires peace education in every school.

In September 2009, the Costa Rican legislature passed a law changing the name of the country’s justice ministry to the Ministry of Justice and Peace.

The new Ministry is working with non-profit organizations to implement a national plan for peace promotion, such as installing mediation programs in schools all over the country and organizing Peace Festivals. Communities are invited to a public place, where peace messages are delivered and a social network is recovered to help prevent crime and promote social peace. There is a National Council for Security and Social Peace, in which all the highest authorities of the government work towards promoting security and peace as a national policy.
III LOCAL PEACE COMMITTEES

3.1 In general

Local peace committees (LPCs)\(^{24}\) can be found in many countries, and are also often called local peace zones and/or zones of peace. They can either be completely new initiatives or have roots in traditional structures like a council of elders. LPCs can be part of a national infrastructure for peace (I4P) with a mandate of the national government, which gives them a formal role.

They can also be independent and driven by the local community, which makes them informal LPCs in that they are not formally recognized by the state. Informal LPCs may have good working relations with local or district governments (while lacking a national mandate) or act in a completely independent way, without any government involvement.

The informal nature of many LPCs is both a strength and a weakness. Informality means the committee is less indebted to political and governmental actors. Often their members are volunteers with a high level of trust and commitment. The weakness is that they often lack the clout to deal with government and political leaders and are easily ignored. This article focuses on informal LPCs, working with or without local government involvement, but lacking a national mandate.

Based on experiences in 13 countries Odendaal and Olivier describe LPCs in their paper as “committees or other structures formed at the level of a district, municipality, town or village with the aim to encourage and facilitate joint, inclusive peacemaking and peacebuilding processes within its own context”\(^{25}\).

LPCs often fulfill a useful function in opening a dialogue in a divided community, solving conflicts and protecting their communities from violence. LPCs can fill a void or compensate weaknesses in local governance and justice. The absence or weakness of legitimate local government structures, coupled with the need to forge consensus between former protagonists and other stakeholders on urgent matters of co-existence at local level, calls for a mechanism to facilitate consensus. LPCs provide such a space.

\(^{24}\) This chapter is based on the article *Potential cornerstone of infrastructures for peace? How local peace committees can make a difference*, (2013) by Paul van Tongeren; in: *Peacebuilding, 2013; Vol.1, No 1; p.1-31.

There is great diversity in LPCs. They often have hybrid structures and may be inspired by traditional conflict resolution mechanisms and modern formal dispute resolution processes at the same time.

When LPCs have a national mandate, they have more clout and have more access to national and other resources. They can also establish a critical link between local and national peacebuilding. But quite a lot of countries have weak, fragile or collapsing governments. They may also be ruled by authoritarian regimes, which are not interested in such peace structures.

What can people do when their national government will not support them in their pursuit of peacebuilding? What can people do at the local level when conflict and violence are escalating in their neighborhood and the government is failing to give protection? The answer, in many countries, has been to create informal local peace committees. Looking at LPCs from different countries some observations can be made:

- diversity of types: there are formal LPCs vs informal LPCs, local grown LPCs vs LPCs established by (I)NGOs;
- tasks and mandate: tasks are mainly related to goals, such as opening a dialogue in a divided community; solving community conflicts; or protecting communities from violence;
- link with local government: most LPCs tend to involve representatives from local government;
- funding: many LPCs function without external support;
- impact: the (temporary) impact of LPCs is mostly related to solved community problems, increased security in the community and/or the empowerment of their members;
- biggest challenge: LPCs can hardly influence the national political context; changes in the national political situation however have a great impact on them, leading to many of them being dissolved.

3.2 Local peace committees in DRC

*Centre Resolution Conflicts in North Kivu*

The conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is sometimes known as Africa's first world war; the fighting involved seven other countries at one time or another and it has proved to be the planet's deadliest conflict since World War II, with more than 5.4 million casualties since 1994.

Centre Resolution Conflicts (CRC) is a Congolese NGO, working in the Eastern province of
North Kivu. It was founded in 1993. CRC has developed from an organization focused on training displaced people to coexist peacefully with members of other tribes into an organization whose mediation skills are called upon by local communities, international NGOs, multilaterals and local government officials right across North Kivu. CRC is now a member of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) protection cluster in the region. The UK NGO Peace Direct started a relationship with CRC in 2004.

CRC is known for its successful community-led disarmament, demobilization and reintegration work in the DRC. It has persuaded ex-combatants to leave the bush and persuaded communities to accept them back. In addition, CRC has educated and assisted 20,000 people across two provinces, by helping 14,400 displaced persons to return safely home, rescuing 650 child soldiers and mobilizing former enemies to resolve conflicts via mediation and negotiation. Much of CRC’s success is based on its ability to engage with armed actors (including rebel groups) and to negotiate the protection of their communities from violence. CRC’s work with armed groups and ex-combatants has played a key role in reducing the number of armed groups active in North Kivu from nine to four, and negotiations are held to get more groups out of the bush.

CRC has become a key link between communities, local government authorities in Eastern DRC and the armed groups in the bush. CRC has a strong focus on working with youth. Local committees for peace created by CRC are non-partisan frameworks for consultation and analysis, reflection and action of grassroots communities around issues of reconciliation, security and participation in the management of public affairs. Since its inception CRC has set up dozens of local peace committees.

LPCs organize hearings, dispel rumors, mount a rapid collective response to incipient violent conflict, continue to support the return of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and ex-combatants to their home communities, encourage communities to initiate peace themselves, provide training and create a permanent link between communities, armed groups and the national army.

Some twenty peace committees have evolved into very active task forces. Task forces bring together key community leaders who have been involved in addressing conflict locally and represent all sectors of the community: media; culture and arts; education; churches; human rights organizations; and so on. A key criterion for membership is being a community leader with a recognized following. They have become an authoritative source of accurate information and have earned the trust of the communities in which they work. By bringing together civil society groups, task forces have created a counter-balance to governmental authority within the
community and become a focal point for local officials.²⁶

*Haki na Amani in Ituri*

Ituri is one of the districts in North-East DRC and is divided into five territories. In all those territories, LPCs have been established. In February 2003, a conference on the proliferation and illegal trafficking of small arms/light weapons in the border region between DRC, Uganda and Sudan was held in Uganda. All three countries sent delegations, including representatives from respective governments, armies, police forces, armed groups, churches, Muslims, human rights groups and social movements. At the time of the conference, Ituri had been plunged into open warfare and a great number of militias operated there. The situation of public order, human rights and internal security was catastrophic. Inter-community relations had been severely damaged by the war and there was deep mistrust. Several organizations asked for a program for inter-community reconciliation. A study was performed to assess the situation in local communities. A key proposal was to organize community *barazas*. A network, later named Haki na Amani (RHA), began its first activities in 2004 and was composed of among others Episcopal Justice and Peace Commissions, human rights groups and a women’s network.

The goals of RHA are the promotion of peace, the protection of human rights, the encouragement of citizen participation in order to create a society governed by law and order, the opposition of identity violence and the positive transformation of conflicts through the expansion of its members’ intervention capacities. International partners and funders are among others IKV Pax Christi, Cordaid and Interchurch Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO) (all three based in the Netherlands), Trocaire and Pax Christi International Alert.

Its main activities were mobilization sessions to transform positively the conflict. These sessions brought together around 100 persons from antagonistic communities, initially intended for all the leaders and notables of the involved communities, but also local militia leaders. Later on, local administrative authorities and other civil society groups were invited as well. At the end of the mobilization session, the participating communities were invited to elect the members of a local peace initiative (ILP). The ILPs were comprised of a committee of around twelve persons who engaged in mediation and conflict resolution in the community. Some 500 ILPs were established.

In the beginning, the ILPs sought to mediate in all sorts of problems by community gatherings, but later, they organized football matches between two communities, reopened schools and markets, helped with the return of displaced persons and so on. All ILPs and local initiatives for

---
²⁶ *External Evaluation of Peace Direct and Centre Resolution Conflicts Project*; (2011) by Rosemary Cairns
Community security (ILSCs) were trained as well in constitutional topics, elections and responsible citizenship before the 2007 elections. The inclusiveness of the ILPs helped to lessen tensions between the communities. During the period immediately following the conflict, they were very useful in a situation in which the slightest dispute could ignite a new war. RHA has strengthened the capacities of the ILP leaders in mediation and solving conflicts.

Later, another vast network for peace was added. Known as *nyumba kumi*, this is a rapid alert system operating at the local level. They are part of the Episcopal Justice and Peace Commission. In total, there were around 800 *nyumba kumi*. Their existence led to the creation of 57 ILSCs. All moderators of ILSCs received training, followed by community barazas, aiming for a participatory exchange of local concerns. The process of bringing together the ILSCs and the state services responsible for securing persons and their property (police and local authorities) in local committees for community security was strongly supported. Material support – bicycles – has been provided to the most active ILSCs.

These ILSCs are highly regarded by the population and all state actors, which gives its actions a seal of social legitimacy. The alert system traditionally used by ILSCs involves shouting, banging on cans or saucepans and whistling. All members of ILP committees and ILSCs participate as volunteers without payment in kind or cash. Payment may lead to intra-group competition.

The creation of RHA and the Ituri program constituted the first action towards enhancing community security in the region. Another step was a 2006 conference on community security and small arms. The main approach was organizing community barazas, gatherings of around 400 people, and a free forum, designed to perform a true assessment of the problems faced by the population. At the end of the meeting, a list of problems was drawn up and accepted by the participants. Key was creating an interface between the different population groups as well as between the state services and the population. At the end of the baraza on community security, representatives were elected to participate in local meetings on the topic of security. After several barazas at community level, a meeting on community security would then be organized at the territorial level. As well as delivering criminals to the competent authorities, ILP and ILSCs have also enhanced the capacity to stand up against state-level abuse and corruption. They have been described positively because of their bottom – up, local, open and inclusive nature, the fact that there are women members and that there has been intensive training and capacity building. Around half of the established ILPs continue to be active, some 300 at present.27

**Village Peace Committees in North Kivu**

The NGO World Relief Congo is establishing village peace committees (VPCs) in North Kivu. At first, an assessment is conducted in order to get more specific information on the amount of ethnic groups, Barza leaders, traditional leaders, church leaders and others living in a village that might play an active role in a VPC. Afterwards a conflict transformation workshop is organized, and elections for a VPC are prepared. A VPC is composed of ten members, including a Barza member, youth leader, woman leader, local authority representative, church leader, school leader and member of civil society. They meet every week. Political authorities invited World Relief Congo to expand the program of establishing these committees to other territories and provinces.\(^\text{28}\)

---

**3.3 Peace Shuras in Afghanistan**

The different wars in Afghanistan since 1978 have resulted in some three million people being killed. However, compared to other countries of similar size and political and economic instability, Afghanistan’s peace structure is surprisingly strong. Harnessing a long tradition of tribal mechanisms for dispute resolution involving councils of the traditional elders of the villages, *Jirgas* or *Shuras* are now important mechanisms for peacebuilding in Afghanistan. Jirgas are usually a temporary or ad-hoc group of respected elders that convenes when necessary to resolve disputes. A Shura is a group of local elders or recognized leaders who convene regularly to make decisions on behalf of their community.

Afghanistan’s formal justice system has traditionally been very weak and has limited presence outside of the major urban areas. These formal institutions, including police and court systems, suffer from limited capacity and widespread perceptions of corruption and inefficiency. As a result, it is estimated that 80 to 90 per cent of Afghans, particularly those living in rural areas, continue to look to informal, non-state institutions to provide justice. These institutions or peace Shuras are often preferred to the formal court system because they are generally led by respected elders who have earned a reputation for fairness, who understand the local community, reach decisions on locally accepted values and norms, and focus less on punishment and more on maintaining community relations. They practice ‘restorative justice’.

---

\(^28\) Based on information from Jean-Pierre Mfuni Mwanza, founder and executive director of Central Africa Conflict Prevention Association (CACOPA)
Two important NGOs aiming for community peacebuilding, among others by establishing peace Shuras, are Co-operation for Peace and Unity (CPAU) and Sanayee Development Organisation (SDO). They have established several hundreds of peace Shuras in Afghanistan. CPAU mentions having established some 500 peace Shuras in their reports. CPAU was established in 1996 and works for the promotion of knowledge and awareness of peace, social justice and human rights as the foundation upon which the nation-building efforts in Afghanistan should be based. Through its ongoing training and coaching programs, CPAU works at district and local level to build up the skills and capacities of local community leaders and representatives from diverse ethnic backgrounds, strengthening the role of community institutions.

SDO was established in 1990. The community-based peacebuilding programs of SDO aim to strengthen the social structures that can enable the constructive transformation of conflicts. By addressing the root causes of conflict, they promote stability, justice, goodwill and co-operation among members of the community. Members of peace Shuras are community elders/leaders, school teachers, community youth, local businessmen and village Mullahs (religious scholars). At the district level peace Shuras, members of district government are included as well. SDO has established some 530 LPCs within thirteen provinces.

CPAU reaches out in villages to local elders and Community Development Council (CDC) members to begin the process of forming peace Shuras. All community members are invited to participate in selecting the members of the new peace Shuras. The villagers elect some 25 male elders to join the new peace Shura. Membership of the peace Shura tends to overlap with that of CDC’s, a government-supported Shura that makes decisions about local development projects. Continuity and overlap with other existing institutions positively affects the local legitimacy of the peace Shuras. Most disputes are over land/property; access to water, inheritance, family, marriage and financial compensation. Where male peace Shuras were created by CPAU and SDO, some 25 women were also selected by female community members to participate in a women’s peace Shura, addressing family disputes especially when they involve female disputants.

Interviewed peace Shura members estimated that they resolved 80 to 90 per cent of their cases. Consensus has emerged within the development community that non-state/local justice and security networks are often more accountable, efficient, legitimate and accessible providers of justice than the agencies and institutions of the post-colonial state. Peace Shuras do not solve the overall conflict, but are important in solving many day to day conflicts and stop them from escalating into violence in this volatile country. Peace Shuras, well trained in conflict resolution and peacebuilding, seem to be able to reduce the gap between communities and formal
governance structures.29

A national solidarity program (NSP), operated out of Afghanistan’s Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development, helps identify, manage and monitor development projects and resources. The NSP provides direct block-grant transfers to democratically elected CDCs at US$200 per family. The CDCs improve local governance, making it more accountable and inclusive; they alleviate poverty and provide jobs. There are some 34,000 CDCs in existence, covering 80 to 90 per cent of rural Afghanistan. Almost all of these CDCs, especially those that are well established, have taken on conflict resolution and peacebuilding tasks. Many observers describe this program as a success. At the national level, a High Peace Council has been established.

3.4. Local Peace Communities in Colombia

Colombia has a history of nearly five decades of internal armed conflict between the Colombian government and various guerrilla groups such as the FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) and ELN (National Liberation Army). Historically, the conflict is rooted in what is known as La Violencia, which was triggered by the 1948 assassination of the populist politician Gaitan. There have been at least 250,000 casualties and millions of displaced people.

Local peace communities, peace committees, peace laboratories and zones of peace have been flourishing in some of the most vulnerable conflict zones. Objectives were to get protection from the surrounding violence, but also to establish participatory democracy and encourage local development. Often community leaders started such a process, but mayors or local administration also took the initiative. Many organized themselves into associations of peace communities to obtain more bargaining power with the armed actors.

There have been hundreds of LPCs with most of them being active between 1998 and 2002. In 1998 Andrés Pastrana Arango was elected president. He had promised to negotiate peace with the guerrilla groups. That year, Bogota-based peace organization REDEPAZ – a network of mostly local and regional peace initiatives – began a project to help establish and support new and existing local peace communities, calling it One Hundred Municipalities for Peace. Four

29 - Opportunities and Challenges for Justice Linkages: Case Studies from Kunduz & Takhar; (2012); Seth Peavey; Cooperation for Peace and Unity (CPAU)
- Strategic Conflict Analysis of Afghanistan (2012); Bjorn Holmberg and al.; Swedepace and CPAU
years later the project came to an end and was replaced by one that sought to develop local democracy. Under Pastrana’s successor, President Alvaro Uribe, government policy changed, aiming for a military solution and peace communities became targets for the security forces.

Most LPCs established institutions to ensure maximum participation in decision making. They had a Constituent Assembly, open General Assemblies or Municipal Forums for all members of the community. Working committees met every month, on specific issues, with representatives of unions, the church, youth & women organizations and so on. Such forums started to identify the causes of violence and poverty in each community and to draw up a development and peace plan for the community.

The success of LPCs – albeit limited – has been largely connected to the degree of involvement by all the community’s various groups and sectors. Also contributing to their success has been the relationship between LPCs and existing local power and governance structures (without becoming too dependent). Many LPCs managed to establish (temporarily) increased security. They empowered their members and local civil society. In the absence of strong leadership for peace at the national level, local and regional initiatives were temporarily filling a gap.30

3.6 City Peace Commission in New Haven (US)

As defined by the United Nations, the culture of peace requires disarmament and security, sustainable, equitable development, education for peace, democratic participation, human rights, equality of women, tolerance and solidarity, and free flow of information. As indicated by a series of interviews of New Haven community activists, all of these aspects are inter-related.

The high level of violence in the city (exaggerated by media emphasis on violent news), is related to unemployment, a failing education system, destruction of the family and family values and easy access to drugs and guns, among other causal factors. The emphasis on community policing is seen as taking a good direction, but it has just begun so it cannot yet be seen if it will produce good results. The high level of unemployment in the city was addressed by two important initiatives of democratic participation in the last year. There was 84 per cent

30 - Colombia: Building Peace in a Time of War; (2009), by Virginia M. Bouvier; USIP; US
- Islands in the Stream: A Comparative Analysis of Zones of Peace within Colombia’s Civil War; (2007) by Catalina Rojas; in Hancock and Mitchell, Zones of Peace, p. 71-90
- Local Peacebuilding and National Peace: Interaction between Grassroots and Elite Processes; Christopher R. Mitchell and Landon E Hancock, eds.
support in the recent referendum sponsored by the New Haven Peace Commission to demand the government to reduce military spending and increase spending for human needs, since, contrary to what many believe, military spending leads to fewer jobs than other government spending. Fuller employment was also the principal demand of the community coalition spearheaded by the Yale trade unions, which got many new members of the New Haven Board of Aldermen nominated and elected last year.

Unemployment and under-employment are keys to the persistent inequality of women, as women struggle to obtain jobs and equal pay, and to raise families at the same time in the face of steep childcare costs, as single head of household, or often with unemployed, imprisoned or violent husbands.

All of the preceding problems impact on the state of human rights in New Haven which has been declining during the economic recession, especially the economic rights to employment, equal pay for equal work, trade unions, adequate food, clothing, housing and medical care for all family members, and the right to quality education.

With regard to education, almost everyone interviewed considered that public education is failing to teach tolerance and solidarity and democratic participation, let alone prepare students for higher education. They all agree that neighborhood schooling, more than magnet or charter schools, are essential to the community-building that is necessary for a culture of peace. The situation is better with regard to tolerance and solidarity; in the face of widespread discrimination against immigrants in the rest of the country, New Haven has taken a lead in providing identity cards for undocumented immigrants. And with regard to the free flow of information, there are important new sources using the Internet such as the New Haven Independent which support a culture of peace, although the main commercial media continue to emphasize the news of violence which ultimately supports a culture of war and violence.

Asked to rate New Haven in these eight areas on a scale from 1 to 10, the activists gave a rating of 4 to democratic participation, tolerance and solidarity, women’s equality, and free flow of information, because there has been some progress, although more remains to be done than has already been accomplished. The greater problems and contradictions with regard to disarmament and security, sustainable equitable development, education and human rights led them to give a lower rating of 3.

All of those interviewed have agreed to be interviewed again next fall to determine if New Haven is making progress towards a culture of peace.
IV CONCLUSIONS

The notion of Infrastructures for Peace is beginning to capture the attention of policy and practice communities engaged in peacebuilding, statebuilding and development. But the international community has not been quick to support I4P. This issue of I4P and attention for local peacebuilding has escaped for a long time the attention of the academic community and researchers, and only recently some publications are published on these issues.

The urge for more attention for I4P is however great, because local and recurring violence has grown in recent years and over 1.5 billion people around the world live in a community affected by war, violence or high levels of crime. The need to transform societies from fragility to resilience is urgent and requires institutionalizing mechanisms and systematically building capabilities to deal with challenges in an inclusive and peaceful manner. An inclusive dialogue is critical to the success of I4P.

We can build on experiences on I4P and Local Peace Committees of some twenty years. Starting with among others the elections in South Africa in 1994, where a peace infrastructure helped to prevent a further escalation of violence, examples in other countries have shown I4P is an promising approach which needs to be further implemented in more countries, but needs further research as well. Systematic documentation and evaluation of existing modalities and the broad diversity of activities & tools and the cumulative experiences in different countries are needed to assemble a body of sound evidence of what works under different conditions.

It seems one good entry point for starting a dialogue about I4P might be the need for peaceful elections. Elections become more contested and polarized; I4P maybe a good tool to facilitate peaceful elections.

Very important is to establish an institution with a clear mandate for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. A Peace Council with a main task as mediator in political and social conflict and advocating social cohesion maybe a preferred role.

31 This chapter is mainly based on the conclusions and collected lessons learned in the following articles:
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In order to play this role, a National Peace Council has to maintain a profile of political impartiality and of trusted interlocutor. A semi-independent peace structure seems a preferable option. Otherwise, it may lose legitimacy and is vulnerable for political manipulation and control.

Effective partnerships are at the center of an I4P and any successful conflict prevention capability. Partnerships in which no actor is dominating, but where conflict prevention and peacebuilding are seen as joint responsibility of the whole society. Key feature of I4P is to have linkages between tracks and levels: connections between and within societal levels, vertical and horizontal links.

Effective conflict prevention and peacebuilding is impossible without ownership and participation by civil society. Civil society actors are insiders whose presence in their communities and participation in conflict prevention efforts are sometimes the most critical factors that enable their communities to seek to resolve rather to fight over their differences.

Local Peace Committees fulfill important roles: they can fill a void in local communities to counter or mitigate fragility or insecurity. They can play a vital role where government is fragile and lacking in legitimacy and where security institutions are failing or non-existent. They fulfill vital functions in fostering dialogue in divided communities, managing conflict and protecting communities from violence. They often have a working relationship with local government.

The interest in I4P is growing as the number of key actors in this field, as among others Local Peace Committees, National Peace Committees and Forums, governments, national NGOs, INGOs, international networks, donors, UN agencies.

An International Forum on Infrastructures for Peace would be helpful to facilitate exchange between key actors; to identify where we may cooperate and how we can enhance the expanding field of I4P.
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Over 1.5 billion people around the world live in a community affected by war, violence or high levels of crime, and over 526,000 people die each year as a result of violence or conflict; approximately one per minute.

Armed conflict wrecks lives, destroys the social fabric within and among communities, imposes economic burdens on countries that can ill afford them and extinguishes any hope of eliminating poverty for millions of people.

Preventing violence not only save lives, but is also cost effective. The cost of measures to promote dialogue and peaceful mediation in a country in order to prevent violent conflict is, on average, just 10 per cent of the cost of recovery after a civil war.

Societies that are resilient to violent conflict are those where different groups can constructively interact with one another to address potential causes of tension, such as socio-economic, political, ethnic, or religious differences, or unequal resource allocation. Such societies have effective state, local and community institutions that can work together, network and deal with political and other challenges in an inclusive and peaceful manner.

Political transitions after regime changes; differences over the conduct and management of political and electoral processes; and management of natural resources are examples of fraught issues that may spark violent conflict. Reducing the likelihood of violence requires adopting a strategic approach, strengthening local and national institutionalized processes, and the building of dialogue and mediation skills.

UNDP helps countries to establish and strengthen national peace infrastructure; the processes, policies and institutions that help design, support and enhance social resilience to violent conflict - and build sustainable freedom from strife.

UNDP’s approach

To assist countries and societies reduce the chances of future conflict, UNDP helps to foster and strengthen the local and national capacity to build peace, by providing government institutions, civil society, NGOs, communities and individuals with advice, training and support in the analysis of issues, trends and patterns that may lead to violence. UNDP also helps to establish early warning and response systems to detect, anticipate, identify and swiftly act upon potential hostilities.

UNDP works to establish and support community, village, regional and national peace councils who engage with potential belligerents and mediate disputes.

When, despite these prevention efforts, violent conflict flares up, UNDP helps to ensure that there is a standing capacity to deal with it; enhancing the capability of stakeholders to resolve issues in a systematic manner. UNDP supports “insider mediators,” who work inside communities to assist with non-violent conflict resolution. UNDP also advocates for the active participation of women in national and local peace infrastructure and initiatives.

Sometimes development efforts may exacerbate existing conflicts. UNDP’s approach includes ensuring that peace and development initiatives are sensitive to the intricacies of local dynamics and don’t inadvertently exacerbate or contribute to underlying tensions and hostilities.

UNDP is active in more than 40 countries, supporting a range of strategically interconnected activities that strengthen the respective national peace architecture. Examples of these initiatives include:
• Assisting communities, groups and nations, building collaboration and consensus among leaders and governments to address recurrent conflicts and violence, such as those related to disputes over natural or extractive resources, inequity, marginalization or exclusion, contested political transitions and elections, governance systems, or constitutional frameworks; and

• Assisting governments to design policies and regulations that support the establishment of peace infrastructure.

UNDP IN ACTION

In Ghana, in the lead-up to elections in 2012, UNDP helped build and strengthen the national and local peace infrastructure by providing mediation training, conflict prevention advice and support to the National Peace Council, police and election officers. These groups were then able to intervene to defuse potential violence, helping to ensure peaceful elections and a successful presidential transition in December 2012.

The peace council has now been established by law as a permanent conflict management body for Ghana and the model is being replicated in Uganda and Zimbabwe. Drawing partly from their own experiences and partly from the Ghanaian example Uganda is strengthening its constitutionally mandated National Consultative Forum, which facilitates inter-party dialogue; while Zimbabwe’s new constitution now includes an independent National Peace and Reconciliation Council that is accepted by all parties.

In Kyrgyzstan, following violence and escalating tension after the April 2010 regime change, UNDP supported the development of local and national peace councils, who, together with government and other members of civil society, jointly analyze conflict trends, and act as mediators and facilitators on contentious issues. In order to help reduce tensions around the Kyrgyz-Tajik and Kyrgyz-Uzbek borders, UNDP supported the establishment of cross-border working groups who meet to address farmers’ use of cross-border grazing lands and trade.

In the aftermath of the political transition in Tunisia in 2011, UNDP helped the new regime to design a locally-led model for political and social dialogue; giving political factions and civil society organizations more voice in the development of the new government and constitutional process.

Insider mediators, or skilled national peace facilitators, played a crucial role in Lesotho when in 2012, the country - for the first time in its history, saw a peaceful political transition when a civilian government willingly handing over power to its opposition.

In 2010, Kenya, a country that has experienced past political hostility, held a constitutional referendum without a single incidence of violence. This was due in part to UNDP supported training of police, peace councils, the government and civil society in how to use technology and crowd sourcing to identify potential violent hot spots and act, through improved security or mediation, to defuse conflicts. This prevention effort identified and pre-empted nearly 150 incidents of violence, and helped political parties reach consensus on the draft constitution before the vote. The system is now in place for future elections.

For more information contact UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY, 10017 USA
www.undp.org/cpr
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VII INFORMATION ON THE TWO ORGANIZING NETWORKS

The Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP), along with the International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace, represent the two organizations specifically focusing on infrastructures for peace in the world.

Global Alliance for Ministries and Infrastructures for Peace (GAMIP)

www.gamip.org

The Global Alliance for Ministries & Infrastructures for Peace is a worldwide community and a non-governmental organization regrouping 102 members from 40 different countries, all of whom work towards establishing ministries for peace at government level, as well as setting up other peace infrastructures.

The Vision and Mission of the Global Alliance are:

Vision: A world where all people, individually and collectively, embody, promote, and practice a culture of peace for the benefit of all.

Mission: To collaborate with and support governments and civil society around the world working to establish national ministries and departments of peace, and also to support efforts to develop local, regional, and national peace councils, peace academies, and other effective infrastructures for peace.

To achieve these goals, the Alliance facilitates for its members the exchange of their resources, information, and support, towards the setting up of national campaigns for the establishment of peace infrastructures. The Alliance also seeks to enhance understanding by civil society and governments of the importance of ministries and infrastructures for peace. Since its creation, the Alliance has played a critical role in the establishment of two of the four existing Ministries for Peace, namely the ones in Costa Rica and Nepal. The other two, in Solomon Islands and Southern Sudan, have also benefited from those dynamics.

One of the main activities of GAMIP is the organization of a biennial conference, the main objectives of which are to share experiences, successes and challenges, to establish relationships between member organizations, to broaden knowledge and competencies within GAMIP, and to raise awareness within civil society and governments on the concepts of ministries and infrastructures for peace. The previous Summits took place in the UK in 2005, Canada in 2006, Japan in 2007, Costa Rica in 2009, and South Africa in 2011. These Summits have gained the support of such noted champions of peace as Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Oscar Arias, His
Holiness the Dalai Lama, the Most Reverend Desmond Tutu, and former member of the US House of Representatives Dennis Kucinich. «Nesting Peace: Creating Infrastructures to Sustain Diversity» is the Sixth GAMIP Summit.

International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace

This network has been established March 2013.

It aims to:

- collect and exchange experiences and best practices of local peacebuilders on I4P and LPCs
- broaden the knowledge on I4P and LPCs, nationally and internationally
- facilitate a dialogue on the potential of I4P and LPCs with different stakeholders
- enhance the position of LPCs and NGOs within I4P.

The website of the network was launched in March as well: www.i4pinternational.org

It gives information about I4P itself; countries, pioneering on I4P; Local Peace Committees; literature; the network and its members and new events and publications. Mid July, we distributed the first issue of the digital Newsletter of the I4P Network, with 28 new articles on I4P.

The network has mid 2013 some hundred members: NGOs, networks, practitioners and scholars.

The network has an Interim Steering Committee to guide the network during its initial stages.

Creating the network is work in progress. We are committed to ensuring all members have an opportunity to influence and shape the network as it develops.
VIII SPEAKERS AT THE SEMINAR

Adams, David
Dr David Adams is the coordinator of the Culture of Peace News Network. Formerly a Professor of Psychology at Wesleyan University (Connecticut, USA), he was a specialist on the brain mechanisms of aggressive behaviour, the evolution of war, and the psychology of peace activists, and he helped to develop and publicize the Seville Statement on Violence. He came to UNESCO in 1992 to develop the Culture of Peace Programme as a supplement and alternative to military peacekeeping operations, and prepared several UN documents, including the draft Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace (1999). When he retired in 2001 from UNESCO he was the Director of the Unit for the International Year for the Culture of Peace, proclaimed for the Year 2000 by the United Nations General Assembly. He is a prolific author on a variety of subjects, whose publications have helped lay the scientific basis for work towards a culture of peace. His works include The History of the Culture of War, World Peace through the Town Hall, and I Have Seen the Promised Land, a utopian novella.

Alihodzic, Sead
Sead Alihodzic gained extensive experience in elections and post-conflict security issues during 11 years of fieldwork for the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The work entailed close cooperation with international military, police and civilian missions involved in multidimensional peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 2008, he joined the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), where he is in charge of the Elections and Conflict project.

Asante, Emmanuel
Most Rev. Prof. Emmanuel Asante, currently the Chairman of the National Peace Council of Ghana and a Fellow of the Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, is the Presiding Bishop of the Methodist Church Ghana. Additionally, he is Chairman of the National Enforcement Body of the Political Parties Code of Conduct 2012, former Head of Department of Religious Studies, Kwame Nkrumah University of
Barbey, Christophe

Christophe Barbey is a lawyer, an independent peace researcher and coordinator at Aprend, the participative institute for the progress of peace. He has worked on the place of peace in constitutions since 1999, including various publications on the topic and participation as a consultant in the re-writing of the constitutions of the Swiss Cantons of Vaud (1999-2002) and Geneva (2008-2012). He has also worked since 1998 on the human right to peace, presently discussed at the Human Rights Council. He is a specialist on non-militarisation (countries without armies and demilitarization), was a sympathizer of the “Occupy Geneva” movement in 2011 and participates in the political debate about the establishment of the electronic vote in Switzerland.

Bombande, Emmanuel

Emmanuel Bombande is co-founder of the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) and the Executive Director. He is a Peacebuilding Practitioner, International Trainer in Conflict Mitigation and Prevention across Africa and beyond. He has been a lead mediator in many community based mediation efforts in West Africa. He served as a member of the UN Advisory Team in Ghana and advised the Government of Ghana on various conflict prevention strategies, including the development of peace architecture for Ghana. Mr. Bombande has a Master’s degree in Conflict Transformation from the Eastern Mennonite University in Virginia, USA. Bombande facilitates and teaches various peacebuilding courses in different institutions. He is Chair of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC).

Bura Ladyi, Henri

Henri Bura Ladyi is the Director of the Conflict Resolution Centre in North Kivu in DRC. He has successfully led community disarmament in local communities, liberated child soldiers from rebel groups and brought them back to their communities and established successfully dozens of Local Peace Committees (LPCs). He is also a partner of UNOCHA (UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) in DRC and of the UK NGO Peace Direct. Henri has dedicated his life to building a peace that will last, and attending the Nesting Peace Summit...
will not only help him to improve peacebuilding organization at a local level, but also to create a network with the other participants.

**Corneliusson, Emma**

Emma Corneliusson initiated her work with I4P and LPCs through joining Cooperation for Peace and Unity (CPAU) in early 2012. Within this Afghan NGO focusing on community level dispute resolution, establishment of peace committees and legal awareness, Emma heads the project implementation, which takes place across Afghanistan.

**Hopp-Nishanka, Ulrike**

Ulrike Hopp-Nishanka has worked extensively on the concept of infrastructures for peace and has just finalized her PhD at the University of Hamburg on the contribution of peace secretariats to conflict transformation in Sri Lanka. Since October 2012 she has been Deputy Head of the Afghanistan/Pakistan division at the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) in Germany. From 2005-2008 she was Deputy Director of the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies in Sri Lanka. She previously worked at the conflict prevention and peacebuilding desk at BMZ and was an active member of the German interagency working group on peacebuilding and development, FRIEND.

**Kadyrova, Raisa**

Recognized as one of Central Asia’s most capable experts on preventing and resolving interethnic conflict, Raisa Kadyrova is the founder and president of the Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI), which grew from a staff of four in 1998 to a team of 35 in 2012, with four field offices across Kyrgyzstan. During the so-called Tulip Revolution of 2005, which ended the 15-year rule of president Askar Akayev, Ms. Kadyrova initiated negotiation and mediation processes between the conflicting parties including government authorities and the opposition, citizens and law enforcement agencies and ethnic groups and political elites. Her reputation as a specialist in conflict resolution is already well established. Ms. Kadyrova was appointed as the coordinator of the Global Partnership in Prevention of Armed Conflict for Central Asia in 2003. Ms. Kadyrova was UNDP National Consultant on conceptual support of the initiative on promoting peacebuilding and security mechanisms at the national level in Kyrgyzstan. She was nominated in 2005 for the Nobel Prize 1000 women for Peace.
Karybaeva, Mira

Since 2010 Mira Karybayeva has been heading the Department of Ethnic, Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society of the President’s Office of the Kyrgyz Republic. The Department was established after the inter-ethnic conflict which took place in a number of the country’s regions during four days in June 2010. Prior to her career in civil service, Mira Karybayeva was a prominent civil society leader who was involved in the advancement of democracy, gender equality and minority rights in the Kyrgyz Republic. She has in-depth experience in working on research, legislation and advocacy. She is known for successfully combining human rights based approach and state management skills in establishment of infrastructure for peace in a very challenging post-conflict period. Being in confrontation with nationalists, she manages to promote democratic values and create foundations for the sustainable peace infrastructure in the country.

Magotsi, Dickson

Dickson Liyayi Magotsi holds a Bachelors Degree in Political Science and a Masters in International Conflict Management from the University of Nairobi, Kenya. He is an accomplished public servant and peace practitioner with a wealth of knowledge and experience in the field of peace and security. His main areas of competence include policy development and implementation, strategic planning development, management and strategy development, capacity building and training, evaluations and strategic reviews, and program management. He is currently the Senior Programme Manager for the Joint UNDP/Government of Kenya Programme on Consolidating the Peace Process and Establishing Foundations for a Successful Political Transition, located at the National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) Secretariat. He is also the Team Leader of the Joint Secretariat of the UWIANO Platform for Peace that brings together state and non-state actors in Kenya, the National Cohesion and Integration Commission, National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management, United Nations Development Programme, Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission, and a host of Civil Society Organizations, where he provided leadership in contributing towards a Peaceful National Referendum Process that led to the Promulgation of Kenya’s New Constitution on 27th August 201 and the peaceful general elections in March 2013.
Mfuni Mwanza, Jean-Pierre

Jean-Pierre holds an MA in Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies from the University of Kwazulu-Natal in South Africa, along with a High Diploma in Translation and Cultural Communication. He is founder and Executive Director of the Central Africa Conflict Prevention Association (CACOPA). Jean-Pierre is a lecturer at the newly created French Institution for Peace Education, Institut Facultaire Maria Malkia in Lubumbashi, and has published an article on The Case for a Ministry of Peace in Africa. He has completed numerous trainings in peacebuilding, peacekeeping and peacemaking.

Mongo Malolo, Eric

Mongolo Malolo has a long experience in development projects and in demobilization, disarmament and reintegration projects. He is active in pacification and reconciliation projects in Ituri since 2006, with the support of IKV Pax Christi. He is coordinator of Haki na Amani, a network of eight local organisations in Ituri, DRC. Haki na Amani has established some 300 Local Peace Committees.

Mpaayei, Florence

Florence Mpaayei is a seasoned conflict resolution and peacebuilding professional with extensive experience in designing strategies for intervention and implementing peacebuilding programmes. For the past 15 years, Ms. Mpaayei has worked in Eastern and Central African countries on building capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding programs. She has also vast experience in promoting the work of civil society at national, regional and international arenas as well working to ensure the representation of women in peacebuilding. She has been Executive Director of NPI-Africa and is now a consultant.
Nderitu, Alice
Alice Nderitu is a Commissioner with the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Commission and Co-Chair of Uwiano Platform for Peace that is largely credited for leading efforts in peaceful processes during the August 2010 constitutional referendum and March 2013 elections following the violence of the 2007/2008 elections. She has been head of human rights education at the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights and Director for Social Justice Education at Fahamu, a UK-based charity that conducts trainings on human rights and social justice in Africa.

Obolensky, Konstantin TO BE CHANGED
Konstantin Obolensky was born on 13 July 1971 in Liestal, Switzerland. He attended schools in Basel, Switzerland, and went on to study law at the University of Basel, graduating with a Master of Law degree in 1997. Until 1999 he practiced law in different law firms in Switzerland, Germany and Russia. He completed an internship at the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) and was recruited for the diplomatic service in 2000. As a diplomatic intern he worked in the Directorate of International Law at the FDFA in Bern. From 2001 to 2002 he was the attaché at the Embassy of Switzerland to Israel in Tel Aviv. He then returned to Bern as a desk officer responsible for Iran and the Maghreb. From 2006 to 2009 he served as deputy head of mission at the Embassy of Switzerland to Pakistan and Afghanistan in Islamabad. In 2009 he headed as counselor the newly founded “Office of the Embassy of Switzerland” in Yerevan, Armenia, that was then part of the Embassy of Switzerland in Tbilisi, Georgia. He was appointed ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Republic of Armenia in 2011. In 2013 he returned to Switzerland to take up the position of deputy head of the Human Security Division of the FDFA with rank of minister. Konstantin Obolensky is married and has three children.

Ojielo, Ozonnia
Dr. Ozonnia Ojielo is the UNDP’s Coordinator for Conflict Prevention and Recovery, based in New York. He has more than 25 years of experience as a peace practitioner, trainer, historian, legal practitioner, journalist, university teacher and transitional justice expert. He is a former Peace and Development Advisor to the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator in Kenya and Ghana, a former president and fellow of the Institute of Chartered Mediators and Conciliators,
Nigeria and a chartered arbitrator. He has written extensively on conflict transformation and prevention, alternative dispute resolution, and transitional justice and peacebuilding processes. He holds degrees in history, law, and strategic and project management, as well as a PhD in Peace and Conflict Studies.

**Paladini Adell, Borja**

Borja Paladini Adell is a professional involved in peacebuilding and conflict transformation activities. During the last nine years, he has been working in Colombia as a UNDP professional for its programme on conflict sensitive development. He is a UNDP Program Analyst serving as head of UNDP’s Offices in Narino and Cauca in southern Colombia.

**Sapkota, Sadhuram**

As a Joint Secretary and Director of the Nepal Peace Trust Fund of the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction, Mr. Sapkota has had long-standing ties with the Government of Nepal, dating back to 1987. He has wide-ranging, valuable work experiences and served the government of Nepal for the past 26 years with expertise and vision. He has been a consultant to a variety of nongovernmental, governmental and intergovernmental organizations on various issues. During this period, he was involved in the drafting and reviewing of different legislation and by-laws, multilateral treaties and agreements, and ordinances, as well as being directly involved in peace building processes, decentralization, good governance, leadership building and conflict management etc. He also participated in various negotiations with the World Bank and ADB for grant and loan projects of Nepal. He was involved as a negotiator in various bilateral and multilateral trade related negotiations, foreign direct investment agreements, air services agreements and agreements on avoidance of double taxation. He possesses a Master's Degree in Comparative Laws (M.C.L.) from University of Delhi, New Delhi, India and a Master's Degree in Political Science from Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal. He also holds an International Graduate Certificate in Environmental Management from University of Adelaide, Australia. Mr. Sapkota was awarded the Prabal Gorkha Dakshin Bahu Fourth Medal 2055 (1999) by the Head of the State of Nepal for significant work on formulating Local Government Policy for Nepal. He was also awarded the N-Peace Award 2012 by the President of The Philippines for "Engage for Peace, Equality, Access, Community and Empowerment" in Manila, Philippines in Oct. 2012.
van Tongeren, Paul
Paul van Tongeren established the European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP) and he was convener of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), which organized, at the invitation of SGUN Kofi Annan, a conference on the role of civil society in peacebuilding at the headquarters of the UN in New York in 2005. Paul was Secretary-General of GPPAC till 2010. He has focused his attention on 'Infrastructures for Peace' since 2010 and is the founder of the "International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace".

Umanzor Alvarado, Dulce
After obtaining a University degree in Law at the University of Costa Rica, Ms. Umanzor Alvarado has worked in the Ministry of Justice and Peace since 1982 in a variety of areas, including Criminal Diagnosis, Minors in Conflict with the Law and as legal counsel for incarcerated adults. Since 1998, Ms. Umanzor Alvarado works as legal counsel for the Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), and especially on the Culture of Peace, with a special emphasis on the prevention of gender violence. In 2003 she became the coordinator of the Commission on Institutional Values of the Ministry of Justice and Peace, and she represents the Ministry of Justice and Peace within the Monitoring Committee of the National System for the Prevention and Focus on Violence against Women and Intra-family Violence as of 2006. She currently is the Executive Director of the Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), an integral part of the National System for the Promotion of Social Peace represented by the Vice-Ministry for Peace, which has the mandate of promoting and coordinating programs and projects aimed at the promotion of peace at the national level.

Unger, Barbara
Barbara Unger is Programme Director Latin America with the Berghof Foundation. She coordinates several projects and programmes on Dialogue, Mediation and Peace Support Structures for Berghof. Before joining Berghof, Barbara was a freelance advisor and trainer for peace and conflict, and she has previously worked with German Development Cooperation. Barbara holds a BA and MA equivalent in
Political Science, a BA in Latin American Studies from the Free University of Berlin and a post-graduate certificate with the German Development Institute. She is a long-term activist and member of Peace Brigades International, a member of the German Platform for Conflict Management and Board member of the Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitators / Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td><em>Doors and Registration open</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 08:45</td>
<td>Morning Connection Circle &amp; Recap</td>
<td>Birger Norup (Peace Alliance Denmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:50 – 09:00</td>
<td>Pairing-up activities</td>
<td>Vishal Sunny Dhawotal (Mauritius Red Cross Society), Warda Houli (Tunisian Red Crescent Society), Kristin Famula (National Peace Academy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:05 – 09:25</td>
<td>Empathy buddy session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Registration closes at 09:15</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30 – 09:35</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Paul van Tongeren (International Civil Society Network on Infrastructures for Peace) / Florence Mpaayei, moderator (Nairobi Peace Initiative and INUA Kenya Foundation, Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:40 – 09:50</td>
<td>Opening of the Seminar</td>
<td>Nicole Wyrsch (Head of Mission, Swiss Peace and Human Rights Policies, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:55 – 10:05</td>
<td>The Ghanian experience</td>
<td>Emmanuel Asante (Chairman of the National Peace Council, Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:20</td>
<td>The Kenyan experience</td>
<td>Dickson Liyayi Magotsi (Head of UNDP/Government of Kenya Programme, National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) Secretariat, Office of the President, Kenya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 – 10:35</td>
<td>UNDP’s support for peace infrastructure</td>
<td>Ozonnia Ojielo (Head of Conflict Prevention and Recovery, Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction, United Nations Development Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 11:00</td>
<td>Initial Plenary Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 11:40</td>
<td>The role of Civil Society in the promotion of infrastructures for peace</td>
<td>Emmanuel Bombande (Executive Director of WANEP, Ghana and Chair of GPPAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 11:55</td>
<td>The Kyrgyz experience</td>
<td>Mira Karybaeva, (Chief of the Division of Ethnic, Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society, Office of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:10</td>
<td>The Costa Rican experience</td>
<td>Duke Umanzor Alvarado (Executive Director, Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), National System for the Promotion of Social Peace and Vice-Ministry for Peace, Ministry of Justice and Peace, Costa Rica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 – 13:00</td>
<td>Continued Plenary Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 14:15</td>
<td><em>Lunch / Hatching Time / interviews and art production / next Summit corner</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 15:45</td>
<td>Case study working groups (1st round):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room A</td>
<td>1. Infrastructures for Peace in Ghana and Kenya</td>
<td>Emmanuel Asante (Chairman of National Peace Council, Ghana), Dickson Liyayi Magotsi (Head of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Room B
2. Infrastructures for Peace in Kyrgyzstan and Nepal
Mira Karybaeva, (Chief of the Division of Ethnic, Religious Policies and Interaction with Civil Society, President’s Office of the Kyrgyz Republic), Raisa Kadyrova (Foundation for Tolerance International, Kyrgyzstan) and Sadhu Ram Sapkota (Joint Secretary and Director, Nepal Peace Trust Fund, Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction, Nepal)

Room C
3. The Vice-Ministry for Peace in Costa Rica and other Peace Infrastructures in Guatemala and Bolivia
Duke Umanzor Alvarado (Executive Director, Directorate-General for Peace Promotion and Civic Coexistence (DIGEPAZ), National System for the Promotion of Social Peace and Vice-Ministry for Peace, Ministry of Justice and Peace, Costa Rica) and Barbara Unger (Berghof Foundation, Germany)

Room D
4. Peace Shuras in Afghanistan
Emma Corneliussen (Cooperation for Peace and Unity (CPAU), Afghanistan) and Ulrike Hoppel-Nishanka (Deputy Head of the Afghanistan/Pakistan Division at BMZ, Germany)